



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Interventions with an internet sexual offender

**Citation for published version:**

Quayle, E & Hayes, E 2014, Interventions with an internet sexual offender. in D Wilcox, T Garrett & L Harkins (eds), *Sex Offender Treatment: A Case Study Approach to Issues and Interventions*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 163-180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118674352.ch10>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1002/9781118674352.ch10](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118674352.ch10)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Sex Offender Treatment

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

Quayle, E. & Hayes, E. (2014). Interventions with an Internet Sexual Offender. In D. Wilcox, T. Garrett & L. Harkins (Eds.), *Sex Offender Treatment: A Case Study Approach to Issues and Interventions* (163-180). Chichester, John Wiley & Sons Ltd. (<http://eu.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-1118674413.html>)

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# **Interventions with an Internet Sexual Offender.**

## **1. Theoretical and Research Basis for Treatment**

In 2001 Buttrell and Carney published research examining treatment provider awareness of the possible impact of the Internet on the treatment of sex offenders in the United States. The majority of practitioners surveyed were unaware of any potentially negative impacts, had no policies restricting Internet use, and felt that probation and parole would be of little assistance in monitoring Internet use. While a decade on we are aware of the impact in terms of the availability of indecent images of children (IIOC), the ease of producing illegal content, and the role that the Internet might place in facilitating the sexual solicitation or grooming of children, we are still struggling to understand what the treatment needs may be and whether these offenders warrant a distinct treatment approach (de Almeida Neto, Eyland, Ware, Galnonzis & Kevin, 2013a). Central to the debate about the assessment, treatment and management of these 'Internet offenders' is whether they belong to a separate group of sex offenders or to a group already known to us who commit contact sexual offences against children and who are merely using a new technology to carry out their offending (Babchishin, Hanson and Hermann, 2010).

Internet sex offenders clearly use the Internet, via a computer, mobile device, games console, smart TV and so on, to commit a crime, and can be seen in this way as similar to other cybercrimes such as identity theft or phishing (Hunton, 2011). The term Internet offenders is often used to describe people whose index

crime is possession of IIOC, but in fact the range of sexual crimes against children involving the Internet includes the production of images, their distribution and online solicitation or grooming. All of these are relatively new crimes and in many jurisdictions what we have seen is a 'proliferation of laws' (Adler, 2002) which, in the UK, now involves Prohibited Images of Children (PIOC) which was created to tackle the demand for non-photographic images of child sexual abuse. These were already illegal to publish or distribute (but not to possess) in the UK under the Obscene Publications Act 1959 (Antoniou, 2013). This law therefore refers to computer-generated child sexual abuse images, as well as manga images, private cartoons and drawings depicting the sexual abuse of children. These categories of offending are clearly not discrete, and it is increasingly likely that all involve IIOC (including online solicitation and grooming as seen in Briggs, Simon and Simonsen's (2011) study).

The question of the similarity or difference of Internet offenders to existing offender groups is in debate as it is apparent that some of those who commit Internet-related offences will also have committed, or will go on to commit, non-Internet-related contact offences against children. In research samples these are often called mixed offenders (Elliott, Beech & Mandeville-Norden, 2013; Neutze, Grundmann, Scherner & Beier, 2012) or generalist sexual offenders (Wakeling, Howard & Barnett, 2011). However, the distinction between these groups largely depends on a known conviction for an additional contact offence, or a known disclosure, with differences between the two. For example, Seto, Hanson and Babchishin (2011) in a meta-analysis of studies examining histories of contact offending by online offenders found that approximately 1 in 8 had an officially

known contact offence sexual history, but in the six studies that used self-report data 1 in 2 offenders admitted to a contact offense. For many practitioners, particularly when trying to establish the level of risk of future offending, this poses considerable challenges and has led to the suggestion that the use of polygraphs may have utility for Internet offenders and result in the disclosure of previously unknown contact offences or risk factors for re-offending (Robilotta, Mercardo & De Gue, 2008). In studies that have used the polygraph (e.g. Bourke & Hernandez, 2009; Buschman, Wilcox, Krapohl, Oelrich & Hackett, 2010) there were differences between the self-reported and polygraph-confirmed elicited disclosure concerning grooming behaviours and contact behaviours towards children in men whose index offence was possession of IIOC. In addition to possible underreporting, the Buschman et al., (2010) study also indicated that these offenders overestimated the ages of the children in the images collected and underestimated the level of sexual victimization within the images.

To date the majority of studies have used contact offenders (with no known history of offences related to IIOC) or mixed-offenders as comparison groups in relation to risk, recidivism or across a number of largely self-reported variables. More recently comparisons have been made between Internet offenders who have been convicted of the possession of IIOC and those convicted of online grooming or solicitation. One further challenge in relation to these groups is our lack of knowledge in many of these studies as to whether the mixed offender group committed crimes that related to the production of IIOC, which has been uploaded to the Internet or distributed through other means such as a mobile phone. Where this has happened it might be argued that these are also Internet

offences as image production may have been in the service of the commission of further Internet crimes (Taylor & Quayle, 2003).

Differences between Internet and contact offenders have also been examined in relation to other characteristics. Elliott et al. (2013) examined the psychological profiles of Internet, contact and mixed Internet/contact sex offenders using self-report measures assessing: offence supportive beliefs; socio affective functioning; emotional management, and socially desirable responding. Their multivariate general linear model indicated a mixed offender profile that was more similar to the Internet offender group than the contact offender sample. The contact offender group demonstrated lower victim empathy, greater pro-offending attitudes, an externalized locus of control, more assertiveness, a diminished ability to relate to fictional characters and greater impulsivity. The mixed offender group showed higher levels of empathic concern for victims. They also demonstrated increased personal distress and perspective-taking ability than the Internet offender group. However, the main factor that distinguished the groups related to offence-supportive attitudes and identification with fictional characters. The second factor identified included higher levels of empathic concern and poorer self-management. These results are similar to earlier findings by Webb, Craisatti and Keen (2007) where Internet offenders exhibited lower levels of psychopathy, more control over their behavior, relatively higher levels of victim empathy and fewer cognitive distortions. Similarly Henry, Mandeville-Norden, Hayes and Egan (2010), using a standard psychometric screening battery, were able to group their sample of Internet offenders into apparently normal, inadequate and deviant. The

inadequate group had clear socio-affective deficits and was not high in pro-offending measures. The deviant group was characterized by poor victim empathy. A further study by Marshall, O'Brien, Marshall, Booth and Davis (2012) reported data from a preliminary study comparing Internet offenders with contact offenders on measures of social anxiety, loneliness and obsessive-compulsive tendencies. They found support for obsessive-compulsive disorder and loneliness as features that differentiate these offenders.

Not all comparisons have been made solely with contact offenders. Graf and Dittman (2011) have noted that there may be a variety of differential diagnoses for Internet offenders, which includes voyeurism. Jung et al. (2013) have noted that it is plausible that some of these social and relational deficits observed in Internet offenders may have an influence on the indirect way in which they offend, similar to what is observed in voyeurs and exhibitionists. They suggest that Internet offenders may be sexually excited by the voyeuristic nature of viewing pornography and masturbating to fantasies while at home, and engaging in maladaptive beliefs that they are not physically hurting a child. Their study compared 50 Internet offenders (image only), 45 exhibitionists or voyeurs and 101 contact offenders. Their results suggested that the three groups were largely similar in terms of personality traits, psychiatric history, intimate relationships, sexual and cultural history. There were differences between the groups in terms of academic achievement and elementary-school behavior. All three groups were likely to have been in cohabiting relationships but the Internet offenders had fewer biological children and more often single at the time of the index offence. This may suggest that low rates of contact abuse by Internet offenders

may relate to lack of access to children. They also suggested that the Internet offenders may report less interpersonal warmth which is not due to a dislike of interpersonal relationships but a lack of social skills that make these relationships uncomfortable and anxiety provoking.

Outside of the Internet Behaviours and Attitudes Questionnaire (IBAQ) developed in 2007 by O'Brien and Webster and the Children and Sexual Activities (C&SA) Scale (Howitt & Sheldon, 2007), there are no measures that have been developed specific to an Internet offending population, with authors such as Tomak, Weschler, Ghahramanlou, Holloway, Virden & Nademin (2009) suggesting that personality scales such as the MMPI-2 have limited utility in differentiating between these different subtypes of sex offenders. However, Magaletta, Faust, Bickart and McLearn (2012), using the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI) did find differences between Internet offenders, contact offenders and a normative sample from the PAI. Their results indicated that interpersonal deficits and depression featured most prominently in the profiles of Internet offenders, who also obtained lower scores on aggression and dominance than contact offenders or the normative sample.

At present there are no specific risk assessment tools in relation to Internet offenders and this has raised issues about the applicability of existing measures. Wakeling, Howard and Barnett (2011) compared the validity of a modified version of the Risk Matrix 2000 (RM2000) with the Offender Group Reconviction Scale 3 (OGRC3) on a sample of adult males convicted of an offence of possession, manufacturing or sharing IIOC, with the majority having at least a

one-year proven reoffending follow-up data. The sample was made up of two groups: 304 generalist sex offenders and 690 'Internet specialists'. Their results indicated that those in the very-high risk category sexually reoffended at a greater rate than the rest of the sample, but there was little difference between the rates in the other three risk categories. Internet specialists seemed less criminal than the generalists group and had lower general reoffending and sexual reoffending risk. For the Internet specialists, almost all sexual reoffending was Internet related, whereas for the generalists, two thirds of all the sexual reoffending was Internet related but a third was non-Internet related. This preliminary work does suggest that modified actuarial measures may have some predictive utility, although low re-offending rates made comparisons challenging. This was also seen as problematic by Webb et al. (2007) using the RM2000 and Stable 2000. Osborn, Elliott, Middleton, and Beech (2010) used the Static-99, the Risk Matrix 2000 as well as a revised Risk Matrix 2000. This version was changed in relation to Internet offenders and removed factors relating to 'stranger victims' and 'non-contact offences'. In their study none of the offenders were convicted for a new offence in the follow-up period (1.5 - 4 years) so it was not possible to look at predictive accuracy but the authors did examine risk categorisations using the original two scales and felt that both overestimated the risk for Internet offenders.

It has been argued that there are no evidenced-based protocols to help guide practitioners with the assessment and treatment of Internet offenders, many of whom would have been convicted of the possession of indecent images of children (also known as child pornography and child abuse material) (Jung et al.,



2013). However, in the UK in 2006 an accredited treatment programme was developed (iSOTP) and clinical impact was assessed following completion of pre and post-psychometric assessments by 264 convicted offenders (Middleton, Mandeville-Norden & Hayes (2009). Their results indicated improvements in socio-affective functioning and a decrease in pro-offending attitudes. The design of this programme was in response to the growth of Internet Sex Offenders in the UK criminal justice system (Middleton & Hayes, 2006). The development of this programme was informed by the current evidence concerning potential treatment targets and was reflected in the 'model of change' which included: increase motivation and reduce discrepancies between perceived pro-social values and behaviour; challenge offence supportive attitudes and behaviours; building empathic responses; reducing the use of sex as a coping strategy; develop adequate relationship, intimacy and coping skills, and develop realistic relapse prevention strategies, which also addresses the development of new pro-social lifestyle goals.

Other treatment developments in the UK, such as Inform and Inform Plus, have been developed by The Lucy Faithful Foundation, and provide a structured psychoeducation programme for Internet offenders ([http://www.lucyfaithfull.org.uk/inform\\_plus.htm](http://www.lucyfaithfull.org.uk/inform_plus.htm)) . Delmonico and Griffin (2008) outline additional assessment and treatment strategies. The latter includes: basic Internet management, electronic management and medication management.

One final area that is worthy of consideration is the role of forensic evidence and how this might inform assessment and intervention with Internet offenders. One

aspect of this offending, not previously seen in contact offences against children, is that these offences leave behind a permanent product: images or text that relate to the offence. Glasgow (2010) has argued that such digital evidence provides insights into the preferred material which is used to generate augmented sexual and interpersonal fantasies, which may evolve over time and change the types of images sought. The pattern of images accessed and viewed over time may reflect evolving sexual interests, an escalation of instrumental behavior and indications of growing compulsivity. They also provide an accurate record of what the offender was accessing which can be compared with self-reports. The only tool that has been developed to systematically rate the content of images is the COPINE Scale (Taylor, Holland & Quayle, 2001) which was adapted by the UK Sentencing Advisory Panel (SAP) to provide a 5-point scale giving an objective estimation of the level of victimization in the images collected. This was used as a 'multiplier' in relation to other aspects of the offence to determine possible sentencing. The content of the images, as measured by the SAP guidelines, has also been used by Long, Alison and McManus (2013) to examine the relationship between IIOC possession and contact offending. Their original sample included 30 dual offenders and 30 non-contact offenders examined in relation to the quantity and types of images collected and their relationship with offending behavior. It was possible to discriminate between groups by previous conviction, access to children and the number, proportion and type of IIOC viewed. Within the dual offenders there was a close match between the type of offence (sexual touching, penetrative abuse and sadism) and the content of the images in their possession.

## **2. Case Introduction**

Mr. M. is a 51-year-old man who was arrested 3 years ago for the possession of child abuse images (Civic Government (Scot) Act 1982 Sect 52A(1)). A second charge of distribution was pled away. He was given an 18 months custodial sentence with an additional 18 months extended sentence. There was evidence that he had used a file sharing programme to access images but no indication that he had distributed images or been in contact with other offenders, or children, through any Internet platforms.

Forensic analysis indicted that in excess of 3,000 still images were located on the hard drive of his computer. There was no evidence of any video files. The images included children across all ages and corresponded to all levels of the Sentencing Panel Guidelines scale (2003). It was, however, noted that the majority of the images were of girls aged approximately between 8-12 years of age (pre-pubescent), largely Levels 1 and 2 (sexual posing or sexual activity between children of both genders), with 152 images at Level 5 of the scale, depicting sadism or bestiality. The images had been downloaded over a period of 6 years, had been sorted into folders, but in a very rudimentary way, and it was noted that few images appeared to have been deleted. Additionally, adult pornography was also found, although it was unclear about the quantity or how recently it had been accessed. They were all saved to the hard drive on his personal laptop and there was no evidence of images on any of the other computers in the house. There was no use of encryption or erasing software

although the laptop was password-protected. It was noted that there was one previous offence dating back to 1989 for drink driving for which he received a fine and lost his license for 12 months.

### **3. Presenting Complaints**

Mr. M's arrest was a devastating shock for the family although he remained in the family home until shortly before the time of sentence, albeit in the spare bedroom. On being given a custodial sentence he lost his job and for a few months contact was lost with his family. Contact was re-established through 'phone calls and letters, but on his release from prison he was not allowed back into the family home. This appeared to reflect both his wife's wishes and the instructions from the statutory child support agencies. However Mr. M and his wife continued to meet on a regular basis.

After a period of approximately 6 months he was allowed back into the family home. He was assessed as no risk to his own children, although restrictions were placed on his level of contact with his son and his friends. While anxious to gain further employment he had not been successful and he was becoming increasingly pessimistic about this. In the interim he had developed an interest in gardening and was spending a lot of time landscaping the family garden. He is not allowed unsupervised access to the Internet.

Mr. M remains, outside of family relations, socially isolated. One of the neighbours has been openly supportive to him although Mr. M. now avoids local events. He remains in the guest bedroom, although he is more hopeful about his

relationship with his wife and they have been out together socially. Mrs. M. would not agree to see a marriage counselor with him. She makes reference to his offending as a massive mistake that she believes will not be repeated. She appeared to have good relationships with the social workers around their children and risk management, and Mr. M. believes the children have adjusted well to his return. Mrs. M. is adamant that should she find him in possession of pornography, their relationship will be over.

#### **4. History**

Mr M. was born and raised in the UK and has an older sister. His father died when he was 7 and his mother remarried when he was 8. He had a poor relationship with his stepfather who was a bully and very controlling, and who occasionally physically abused him. His relationship with his mother was reported to be good but lacking emotional closeness, and he keeps infrequent but regular contact with her and his sister. His stepfather died 10 years ago. He successfully completed a degree in accountancy and business studies and after graduation he started work with a Building Society. He did moderately well in his work and earned an average salary, although less than his wife.

He met his wife when they were at university and had had one earlier relationship before this. They married 2 years after graduation and had two children: a girl of 17 years and a boy who is 15. They have a comfortable house in a middle class area of the city. Mr. M. is a regular and quite heavy drinker, but there is no evidence of dependency and he has never abused drugs. His physical and psychological health is good.

Mr. M.'s introduction to sex was through finding his stepfather's pornography collection when he was aged 11 to 12. He gained popularity with his friends by sharing these. He attended an all boys secondary school and described himself as 'shy', particularly around women. Apart from some very brief explorations with fellow pupils, he had no romantic or sexual experiences at school.

Mr. M. felt held back by his shyness when at University and his hopes of sexual adventures did not materialize. With the exception of one occasion when he was drunk he has remained faithful to his wife. He continued to use pornography (commercially available magazines and DVDs) throughout his life, apart from the first few years of his marriage, and has on occasion visited strip/lap dancing clubs. He views himself as sexually active, but not unusually so, and acknowledges an interest in various types of fetishistic pornography which has never been realised in his relationship.

## **5. Assessment**

Mr. M. describes a distancing in his relationship with his wife over time. He attributes this to her tiredness and gynaecological difficulties, which led to a significant reduction in their sexual activity. At the time of the offending Michael had got into the pattern of going into his 'study' later in the evening after his wife had gone to bed. The children would either be in their rooms or out with friends. He would take a whisky (or 2) and start accessing pornography. He states that he came across indecent images of children through pursuing an interest in school uniform images. Although he says he was initially horrified, he admits to

finding the images 'thrilling' although he maintains this was more to do with the illicitness than sexual interest. He denies any arousal to the more violent images and states that he 'he should have deleted them'. However he acknowledges using the other pictures for masturbation and this appears to have become more frequent over time, and would be daily if he was feeling stressed. On the Risk Matrix 2000 he scored low, with no aggravating factors. His Stable assessment score was 6: 1 as he was only able to identify wife as a significant other; 1 as though not lonely has few social contact following arrest; 1 for sexual preoccupation (long standing pornography use, and slightly elevated masturbation of 2-3 times p week); 1 for sex as coping (use of pornography as a mood enhancer/dealing with boredom/emotional regulation) and 2 for deviant sexual interests.

Psychometric assessment indicated a high score for impression management. The only other elevated (although not high scores) were for emotional loneliness and external locus of control. He scored very low on the deviancy questionnaires.

## **6. Case Conceptualization.**

As previously noted, Mr. M.'s earlier developmental experiences were marked by the death of his father when he was aged 7 and his mother remarrying a year later. His relationship with his mother was experienced as emotionally distant and his relationship with his stepfather was punitive and at times physically violent. His stepfather was also a user of pornography and Mr. M. gained popularity with his friends through sharing these magazines. He attended a

single-sex school where he felt shy and socially uncomfortable and this continued throughout his University life. There were very few romantic or sexual relationships in his life and his wife is the only person that he has had a sustained relationship with. Throughout his life he has used pornography as an aid to fantasy and masturbation, and has occasionally used strip clubs or lap dancing when not with his wife. He acknowledges having a sexual interest in school uniforms and this is described as his route into accessing IIOC. There may be other fetishistic interests that have not been disclosed. He would always have masturbated as a self-soothing way of dealing with painful feelings and this appears to have increased over time. It is likely that alcohol has also been used in a similar way. There has also been a decrease in sexual and emotional intimacy with his wife, which he attributes to her illness and general levels of tiredness. Outside of his wife's family and friends he appears to be socially isolated and keeps something of a distance between himself and his mother and sister. Going online to access pornography and IIOC was associated with alcohol and being able to create a safe space (his study) in which to commit these offences, while feeling secure and possibly reassuring himself that what he was doing was without harm to others.

Early experiences impacted on attachment relationships and undermined his self confidence in social relationships. Exposure to pornography in early puberty facilitated relationships with peers, but was also later used to fuel masturbatory fantasies, provide emotional relief from anxiety, and largely substitute for real life relationships in early adulthood. While he successfully negotiated a sexual relationship with his wife this had been impacted on by her illness and general



tiredness resulting in emotional distance and sexual disengagement. In contrast to him she was more socially outgoing, had an extensive family with whom she was close, and a more successful career. With the availability of the Internet his response to social anxieties and emotional loneliness was to seek out a private space within his home to access both legal pornography and IIOC. It is possible that his fetishistic interest in school uniforms facilitated the progression from legal to illegal content, and the false sense of security which followed his access to images at home and the disinhibition that followed from by his accompanying alcohol intake.

## **7. Course of Treatment and Assessment of Progress**

Mr. M. attended a prison based sex offender programme during his sentence. While he was not assessed as having a high level of treatment need it was recommended that he take part in a community programme to reinforce what he had learned. During the group sessions he was co-operative, although level of engagement was in question as he required prompting to contribute. After 7 months he was referred to a relapse prevention group in the community, which he felt was unnecessary, but participated in. As the group continued he became an increasingly enthusiastic and appeared to gain a lot out of support from the other men. He felt that the most impactful part of the programme was the victim awareness exercises, which he used to reflect on how he would be able to talk to his children about his offending.

While the view of the group facilitators largely concurred with the value of the victim awareness exercise to Mr. M., concern was expressed as to whether the

group work interventions were appropriately targeted, particularly in relation to his sexual behaviour and interests. His status as low risk meant that he was not assigned to a programme that would have examined these in more depth. There were concerns that given his past history, that if circumstances deteriorated, he would return to pornography use and potentially reoffend by accessing IIOC.

## **8. Complicating Factors**

Mr. M. had no known psychological and physical illnesses. His use of alcohol at times was excessive, but there was no suggestion of dependence. However, there were concerns that he used alcohol in a similar way to his use of the Internet and IIOC: as a form of emotional avoidance. Marshall and Marshall (2000) proposed that sex offenders use sexual behaviours as a coping mechanism when in a state of negative affect, and Howells (2004) suggested that this is reinforced because it is effective. This has been contested by McCoy and Fremouw (2010) arguing that methodological limitations preclude a causal relationship between negative affect and sexual offending. In addition, Wall, Pearce and McGuire (2011) addressed some of the methodological limitations identified (for example, by using a non-offending comparison group) but did not find any differences between Internet offenders, contact offenders, non-sexual offenders and non-offenders on scales of emotional avoidance. However, there has been support from Middleton, Elliott, Mandeville-Norden and Beech (2006) and Wetterneck, Burgess, Short, Smith, and Cervantes (2012).

## **9. Access and Barriers to Care**

At present Mr. M. has support from his immediate family and there is some

suggestion that he is managing to rebuild his relationship with his wife, albeit there is no change in their sexual relationship. As previously identified, Mrs. M. has decided that she will not seek any help with this. She is currently working, while Mr. M. remains unemployed and, given his unwillingness to go outside of his immediate environment, socially quite isolated. Throughout his life Mr. M. has used pornography as a stimulus for sexual fantasy and behaviour, and this has now been presented by his wife as a situation that she will not tolerate. While at present he has only supervised access to the Internet there must be concerns that given his limited self-soothing behaviour, should be feel elevated levels of stress with regard to his marital relationship or his lack of employment, that he may seek to alleviate this by going online to access sexual material, and possible IIOC. Eke, Seto and Williams' (2011) research on the histories of Internet offenders and the likelihood of future offending would suggest that with a longer period post offence more offenders are detected for new offences, with recidivism for contact sexual offences predicted by criminal history, and in particular violent offense history and the age of the offender at the time of their first conviction. However, importantly, they also examined failures on conditional release, and in particular where offenders put themselves in 'risky' situations, such as being alone with children. Their analysis suggested that one-quarter of the extended sample were charged with failures, which is consistent with other sex offender groups. Failures included breaches of conditions about being alone with children, accessing the Internet and contacting children and downloading IIOC, as well as other violations which were non-sexual or indicated non-compliance.

## **10. Follow-Up.**

Mr. M. has so far attended one relapse-prevention programme in order to consolidate progress. He felt supported in this. At this point the outcomes of this follow-up is unclear.

## **11. Treatment Implications of the Case**

Some concern was felt by the group facilitators that the programme did not directly target Mr. M.'s sexual behaviour or his sexual interests, and the function of the offending for Mr. M. was not fully explored or addressed. While he seemed to gain benefit from the empathy exercises that explored the relationship between the images and sexual victimisation and exploitation of children, the origins of these interests and his fascination with school uniforms was not explored in any detail. In addition, in common with many men who are convicted of Internet related offences, restrictions were placed on his use of the Internet. Berlin and Sawyer (2012) have commented on the compulsive use of the Internet by these offenders and that dramatic consequences for them of being caught accessing IIOC. The loss of the Internet has a profound impact on routine activities, such as seeking employment, paying bills, and accessing travel, serving to isolate such men further and increasingly set them apart from others. Yar (2013) has suggested that these prohibitions are intended not only to facilitate the punishment and incapacitation of Internet sex offenders, but also to prohibit people deemed as high-risk from accessing Internet sites and services in the first place. This is seen as a pre-crime preventative logic of action (Zedner, 2007).

De Alemida, Neot, Eyland, Ware, Galouzis and Kevin (2013b) have argued that access to Internet-enabled computers is often restricted as a condition for serving a community sentence, leaving these offenders with no opportunity to practice skills acquired in treatment until their sentence has expired. This often co-incides with a withdrawal of psychological support when there may be fewer incentives for the implementation of relapse-prevention skills. Importantly, the skills acquired in therapy may not have been practised in ways that ensure generalisability into 'real life' scenarios. They conclude that access restrictions may provide only a temporary reduction in Internet recidivism, that may be restricted to the length of the sentence.

## **12. Recommendations to Clinicians and Students.**

Internet sex offenders represent a heterogeneous group of men, who engage in sexual offences against children that have a lot in common with voyeurism.

While we have some understanding of which men pose the greatest risk to children in the offline environment (offending history, age at first arrest, substance use and sexual interest in children), these will not apply to many of those convicted of 'Internet-only' offences. The challenge is whether they have a need for treatment at all, and if they do, whether these treatment needs can be met by existing programmes and alongside other sex offenders. Jung et al. (2013) has suggested that this may not be a cost-effective approach as many, but not all, of these men would benefit more from interventions that are tailored to maintaining their inhibitions (both internal and external) to the commission of contact offences, and focusing more on decreasing their 'unique characteristics of emotional loneliness and interpersonal difficulties'. Certainly, the case of

Mr.M. highlights difficulties with emotional and sexual relationships and a reluctance to form close interpersonal bonds. The case also illustrates how the Internet affords opportunities to meek sexual and emotional needs and facilitates access to deviant material which might otherwise never have been obtained, or not without considerable effort. Given the way that the Internet and online social media dominate our lives, it is likely that intervention with such offenders will by necessity have to consider how we can support them to engage with a technology-mediated world and meet their needs in ways that will not result in the commission of further offences.

### **Acknowledgement**

The authors would like to thank our colleague, Susan Forsyth, Senior Social Worker, Community Intervention Service, Edinburgh, for her considerable help with this chapter.

### **References.**

- Adler, A. (2001). The perverse law of child pornography. *The Columbia Law Review*, 101(2), 209-273.
- Antoniou, A. (2013). Possession of prohibited images of children: Three years on. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 77, 337-353.
- Babchishin, K. Hanson, R.K. & Hermann, C.A. (2010). The characteristics of online sex offenders: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 23, 93-123.
- Berlin, F.S & Sawyer, D. (2012). Potential consequences of accessing child pornography over the Internet and who is accessing it. *Sexual Addiction &*

- Bourke, M.L. & Hernandez, A.E. (2009). The 'Butner Study' redux: A report of the incidence of hands-on child victimization by child pornography offenders. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 183–191.
- Briggs, P., Simon, W.T. & Simonsen, S. (2011). An exploratory study of Internet-initiated sexual offenses and the chat room sex offender: Has the Internet enabled a new typology of sex offender? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 23*(1) 72–91.
- Buschman, J., Wilcox, D., Krapohl, D., Oelrich, M., & Hackett, S. (2010). Cybersex offender risk assessment. An explorative study. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*,(2), 197-209.
- Butrell, F.P. & Carney, M.M. (2001). Treatment provider awareness of the possible impact of the Internet on the treatment of sex offenders: An alert to a problem. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 10*(3), 117-125.
- De Almeida Neto, A.C., Eyland, S., Ware, J. Galouzis, J. & Kevin, M. (2013a). Internet sexual offending: Overview of potential contributing factors and intervention strategies. *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law, 20*(2), 168-181.
- De Almeida Neto, A.C., Eyland, S., Ware, J. Galouzis, J. & Kevin, M. (2013b). Internet sexual offending: Overview of potential contributing factors and intervention strategies. *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law, 20*(2), 182-187.
- Delmonico, D.L. & Griffin, E.J. (2008). Online sex offending. In D.R. Laws & W.T. O'Donohue (Eds.), *Sexual Deviance: Theory, Assessment and Treatment*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Eke, A. W., Seto. M.C. & Williams, J. (2011). Examining the criminal history and future offending of child pornography offenders: An extended prospective

- follow-up study. *Law & Human Behavior*, 35(6), 466-478.
- Elliott, I.A., Beech, A.R. & Mandeville-Norden, R. (2013). The psychological profiles of Internet, contact, and mixed Internet/contact sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(1), 3-20.
- Henry, O., Mandeville-Norden, R., Hayes, E. & Egan, V. (2010). Do internet-based sexual offenders reduce to normal, inadequate and deviant groups? *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 16:1, 33-46.
- Hunton, J. (2011). A rigorous approach to formalising the technical investigation stages of cybercrime and criminality within a UK law enforcement environment. *Digital Investigation*, 7, 105-113.
- Glasgow, D. (2010). The potential of digital evidence to contribute to risk assessment of internet offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 16(1), 87-106.
- Graf, M. & Dittman, V. (2011). Forensic-psychiatric treatment of Internet offenders. In D.P. Boer, R.Eher, L.A. Craig, M.H. Miner & F. Pfäfflin (Eds.), *International Perspectives on the Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offenders: Theory, Practice and research*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jung, S., Ennis, L., Choy, A.L. & Hook, T. (2013). Child pornography possessors: comparisons and contrasts with contact and non-contact offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 19(3), 295-310.
- Long, M.L., Alison, L.A. & McManus, M.A. (2013). Child pornography and likelihood of contact abuse: A comparison between contact child sexual offenders and noncontact Offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(4), 370-395.



- Magaletta, P.R., Faust, E., Bickart, W. & McLearen, A.M. (2012). Exploring clinical and personality characteristics of an adult male Internet-only child pornography offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and comparative Criminology*,
- Middleton, D., Elliott, I. A., Mandeville-Norden, R., & Beech, A. R. (2006). An investigation into the applicability of the Ward and Siegert Pathways Model of child sexual abuse with internet offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 12, 589-603.
- Middleton, D. & Hayes, E. (2006). Internet Sex Offender Treatment Programme Theory Manual. London: National Offender Management Service (NOMS) Interventions Unit, Ministry of Justice.
- Middleton, D., Mandeville-Norden, R. & Hayes, E. (2009). Does treatment work with Internet sex offenders? Emerging findings from the Internet Sex Offender Treatment Programme (i-SOTP). *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 15(1), 5-19.
- Neutze, J., Grundmann, D., Scherner, G. & Beier, K.M. (2012). Undetected and detected child sexual abuse and child pornography offenders. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 35, 168-175.
- Osborn, J., Elliott, I.A., Middleton, D., & Beech, A.R. (2010). The use of actuarial risk assessment measures with UK internet child pornography offenders. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 2, 16-24.
- O'Brien, M.D. & Webster, S. D. (2007). The construction and preliminary validation of the Internet Behaviours and Attitudes Questionnaire (IBAQ). *Sex Abuse*, 19, 237-256.

Robilotta, S.A., Mercado, C.C. & De Gue, S. (2008). Application of the polygraph examination in the assessment and treatment of Internet sex offenders.

*Journal of Forensic Psychiatry Practice*, 8(4), 383-393.

Taylor, M & Quayle, E. (2003) *Child Pornography: An Internet Crime*. Brighton: Routledge

Wakeling, H.C., Howard, P. & Barnett, G. (2011). Comparing the validity of the RM2000 Scales and OGRS<sub>3</sub> for predicting recidivism by Internet sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 23(1) 146–168.

Webb, L., Craisatti, J., & Keen, S. (2007). Characteristics of Internet child pornography: A comparison with child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of research and Treatment*, 19, 449-465.